

REMARKS

Following the final rejection dated February 11, 2005, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks. Claims 1, 9, 13, 19 and 27 are amended by this Amendment. Support for the claim amendments is found at page 5, line 23 to page 6, line 8 and elsewhere in the specification. No claims are added or canceled by this Amendment. Claims 1-15, 17-22, 27-32 and 34 remain pending in the application. This Amendment is accompanied by an Interview Summary for the in-person Interview between applicant's undersigned representative and Examiner Nguyen which took place on April 26, 2005.

Pending §102 and §103 Rejections

Claims 1, 9, 13 and 19 are rejected under §102(e) in view of U.S. Patent 6,476,833 (Moshfeghi). Claims 1-5, 8-15, 17-22, 27-32 and 34 are rejected under §103(a) in view of U.S. Patent 6,466,971 (Humpleman) and further in view of Moshfeghi. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under §103(a) in view of U.S. Patent 5,973,683 (Cragun) and further in view of Moshfeghi.

The first cited patent to Moshfeghi pertains to a system for controlling the browser functionality in the context of an application. The administrator of the Moshfeghi system can change the resource access and browsing function privileges of remote users by editing their user profiles stored centrally in the system. However, the Moshfeghi patent does not disclose or suggest to configure an information appliance by comparing its user interface with the user interface of a remote device which has more interface functions. Neither of the two secondarily cited patents, the Humpleman patent and the Cragun patent, overcome the deficiencies of the

Moshfeghi patent. Accordingly, the Moshfeghi patent, either taken singly or as a hypothetical combination with the Cragun patent or the Humbleman patent, does not disclose or suggest features of the claims. For example, the patents cited in the Office Action do not disclose or suggest “receiving, through a network to the information appliance, user interface data describing one or more user interface functions on a remote device, wherein at least some of the one or more user interface functions may be added to the information appliance from the remote device [and] comparing the user interface data with a user interface template of the information appliance, the user interface template including one or more representations,” as recited in amended claim 1 or the similar features recited in independent claims 9, 13, 19 and 27. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency, and because they recite additional novel subject matter.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the pending rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present Amendment makes a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain any unresolved issues, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact applicant's representative, Scott Richardson, at telephone number 1.703.739.0573 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

April 28, 2005

Scott Charles Richardson

Scott Charles Richardson
Reg. No. 43,436

Olds, Maier & Richardson, PLLC
128 North Pitt Street, 2nd Floor
Alexandria, VA 22314

Tel. 1.703.739.0573